

Application Number 10/537729
Response to the Office Action dated 09/26/2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 26 2008

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations of original claims 2 and 5; accordingly, claims 2 and 5 have been cancelled without prejudice; and claims 3 and 4 have been amended editorially.

Claims 9 and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 11 has been added as supported by the specification at page 7, lines 6-13; and Fig. 4.

Claim 1 and 6-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saito (U.S. Patent No. 6,512,603), which is corresponding to U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0135824 cited in the IDS filed on June 7, 2005. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to include a limitation of original claim 5. Because claim 5 has not been included in this rejection, the rejection is moot. Further, claims 9 and 10 have been cancelled, and the rejection of these claims is also moot. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Claims 2 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito (U.S. Patent No. 6,512,603). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations of original claims 2 and 5. Claim 4 depends from claim 1. Because claim 5 has not been included in this rejection, the rejection is moot. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Application Number 10/537729
Response to the Office Action dated 09/26/2007

Claims 3 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito (U.S. Patent No. 6,512,603) in view of Furusawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,357,903). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Firstly, Saito discloses a light guiding plate, i.e., a light guide (205) (see Fig. 14) but does not disclose or suggest that the light guide is transparent through which light leaks. Because the light guide in Saito is not transparent and can prevent leakage of light from the light guide properly, the reference does not need to add a reflector to the apparatus. In addition, Saito seeks to avoid an increase of size of the apparatus and costs, due to an increase in the number of parts and his objective is to provide a small apparatus that could be easily assembled (see coln. 2, lines 30-38). Therefore, those skilled in the art would have no reason based on Furusawa to substitute the light guide of Saito for a combination of a light guide formed with transparent resin and a reflector as Furusawa discloses.

Secondly, Saito discloses neither the reflector nor accordingly, its location. Furusawa discloses a reflector (5), which prevents emission of noise light (see coln. 7, lines 8-11). However, Furusawa does not disclose or suggest a partition wall that is provided on a case (1) and separates the light guide and the sensor IC chips as claim 1 requires and accordingly, does not disclose or suggest that the reflector (5) is provided on such partition wall as claim 1 requires. Therefore, the reflector of claim 1 is distinguished from Furusawa, and Furusawa does not remedy the deficiencies of Saito.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 3 and 5 should be withdrawn.

Application Number 10/537729
Response to the Office Action dated 09/26/2007

In view of the above, Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance.



Dated: March 26, 2008

DPM/my/ad

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300